

APPENDIX G

Environmental Checklist Form

1. Project title: **Interim Remedial Action, Groundwater collection and Treatment System, Page Property**
2. Lead agency name and address:
North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board
5550 Skylane Boulevard, Suite A
Santa Rosa, CA 95403
3. Contact person and phone number: Janice M. Goebel, (707) 576-2676
4. Project location: 4280 Canyon Road, Willits, California, Mendocino County
5. Project sponsor's name and address:
Willits Environmental Remediation Trust (WERT)
6016 Princeton Reach Way
Granite Bay, CA 95746
6. General plan designation: _____ 7. Zoning: _____
8. Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)
The project consists of installing a groundwater extraction and treatment system to prevent groundwater contaminated with hexavalent chromium from entering Darby Creek, a tributary to Outlet Creek and the Eel River. The project includes an extraction trench where contaminated groundwater emerges from the side of the hill, pumping of contaminated groundwater to the top of the hill where it will be treated to below detectable levels and then discharged to Darby Creek. The treatment system consists of a filter to remove sediment, carbon vessels to remove contaminants, and a holding tank to meter the discharge to Darby Creek
9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:
The site is a 2.4 acre parcel surrounded by agricultural land. The parcel is in the foothills and on the east side of Little Lake Valley. Darby Creek flows at the base of the parcel to Little Lake Valley and discharges to Outlet Creek and the Eel River. The parcel is the location of a former burn dump where industrial wastes were disposed from the 1960's to 1974
10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.) None

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

Aesthetics	Agriculture Resources	Air Quality
Biological Resources	Cultural Resources	Geology /Soils
Hazards & Hazardous Materials	Hydrology / Water Quality	Land Use / Planning
Mineral Resources	Noise	Population / Housing
Public Services	Recreation	Transportation/Traffic
Utilities / Service Systems	Mandatory Findings of Significance	

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- X** I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Date

Signature

Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or

individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

Issues:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
The project site does provide views over a large area. The viewshed of the project area as seen from afar will not substantially change as a result of the project. (1)				
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
The project is not within sight of any state scenic highway, and the project will not result in the damage of scenic resources such as trees and rock outcroppings. (1)				
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				X
The project will not substantially change the appearance of the site. A small building will be constructed to house the groundwater treatment system. However, the building will be constructed to blend in with the rural agricultural setting. (1)				
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				X
The project will not create a new source of substantial light or glare. No security lights or other outdoor lighting are proposed to be installed as part of the project. (1)				
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				
The construction of a small building to house the groundwater treatment system will not impact the current use of the site. Currently the land is used to graze cattle. (1, 6))				
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
The parcel is not protected under an existing Williamson Act contract. (1, 2)				
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				X
The current agricultural uses of the property, cattle grazing, will not change as a result of the project. (1)				
III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
The proposed project is within the jurisdiction of the Mendocino County Air Pollution Control District (MCAPCD). The project will not conflict or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. (1, 3)				
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				X
The air quality in Mendocino County exceeds the State requirements for particulate matter as discussed in 3(a) above. Mobilization of construction equipment to construct the extraction trench, and foundation for the building may need to acquire a State Portable Equipment if: 1) the equipment has a portable diesel engine over 50 h.p. and 2) the diesel engine is not the same engine that drives the truck. (1, 3)				
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				X
The proposed project will not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. There will be a temporary increase in emissions from construction activities, but that will cease upon project completion. (1,3)				
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				X
The proposed project will only increase emissions from construction vehicles, but that will cease upon project completion. (1, 3)				
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X
There may be vehicle emission odors in the immediate vicinity of a construction vehicle. There will be no odors related to the groundwater extraction and treatment system. (1,3))				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
The project will occur adjacent to Darby Creek, but will not disturb the riparian vegetation of Darby Creek. (1, 5, 7)				
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
The extraction of contaminated groundwater is a mitigation measure to abate the discharge of hexavalent chromium to Darby Creek. (1, 4, 5)				
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
The proposed project is not a wetland area. The construction of the extraction trench will be adjacent to Darby Creek, but outside of the creek channel. No removal, filling or interruption to Darby Creek will occur. (1, 5)				
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				X
The proposed project will not disturb Darby Creek and therefore will not interfere with fish or wildlife species. The Department of Fish and Game has stated that Darby Creek is not a resident or migratory wildlife corridor. (1, 4, 5)				
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
There are no local ordinances that affect this parcel. (1, 4, 5)				
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X
There are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Plans at the project site. (1)				
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in ' 15064.5?				X
The project will not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. (8)				
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to ' 15064.5?				X
See Item 5(a) above.				
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
The site is a former burn dump and the land has been completely disturbed. Metal debris and garbage is buried at the site. (1,5)				
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X
No burial sites are known in the vicinity of the project, and most of the project site has already been disturbed by past operations as a former burn dump. One excavation is planned at the base of the former burn dump. In the unlikely event that any human remains are unearthed during the project, state law requires that the County Coroner be notified to investigate the nature and circumstances of the discovery. At the time of discovery, work in the immediate vicinity would cease until the coroner permitted work to proceed. If the remains were determined to be prehistoric, the find would be treated as an archaeological site. (1, 5)				
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				X
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				X
The project is located on the eastern edge of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The purpose of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act is to prohibit the location of most structures for human occupancy across the traces of active faults and to thereby mitigate the hazard of fault rupture. The project consists of building a structure to house the groundwater treatment system. The building will be constructed in accordance with Mendocino County Building requirements. There will be no human occupancy of the building. (1, 5, 9)				
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				X
The project site is within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, and strong seismic ground shaking can occur throughout the County. However, the project will not result in strong seismic ground shaking. (1, 5, 9)				
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

The property sits atop bedrock consisting primarily of siltstone, sandstone, and serpentinite. The site geology is not conducive to liquefaction (1, 5, 7)

iv) Landslides?

The trench for the extraction system is located at the base of the landfill. The landfill is a former burn dump, and metal debris is linked throughout the landfill. Digging the extraction trench at the bottom of the landfill will not result in the creation of landslides. (1, 5, 6)

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? X

There will be only minimal disturbance of soil at the site during construction of the building, and the extraction trench will be approximately 4 feet wide by 15 feet deep. Minimal disturbance of the site will be conducted to construction this project. (1, 5, 7)

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? X

Refer to VI. iii above.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? X

Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code is an index of the relative expansive characteristics of soil as determined through laboratory testing. Soils underneath the slab of the building will be tested for expansive characteristics as part of the geotechnical investigation (1, 5).

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? X

There will be no septic tanks or wastewater disposal systems installed as part of the project. A portable toilet will be present at the site during construction activities. (1, 6)

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS B Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? X

Groundwater is contaminated with hexavalent chromium. Contaminated groundwater from the extraction system, and purge waters generated when sampling groundwater monitoring wells will be treated and discharged to Darby Creek at levels below the detection limit of 1 part per billion (ppb). The contaminated groundwater and purge waters is not classified as a hazardous waste. No wastes will be transported. (1, 5)

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? X

Contaminated groundwater and purge waters are not classified as a hazardous materials. The treatment system and

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
all appurtenant fixtures will be designed and constructed with secondary containment in the event of an accidental release. 1, 5, 7)				
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
No hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste is anticipated. The site is not located within one quarter mile of a school. (1, 5, 7, 10)				
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
The former Remco Hydraulics Facility is listed on the Department of Toxic Substances Control's "Site Cleanup – Site Mitigation and Brownfield Reuse Program Database". The Page Property is not listed on DTSC's database, however, the hexavalent chromium contamination was generated at the former Remco Hydraulics Facility and was transported and disposed at the former Page Property burn dump. (11, 12)				
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
The site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport (1,10).				
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. (1, 10)				
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
The project would not interfere with the evacuation of the area by local residents in the event of an emergency. The project is located in a rural area, and will not impact roads leading to residents in the area. (1, 5)				
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X
The site is located within a wildland fire area, but is considered to be a low to moderate risk area. An example of a high risk area is the Oakland Hills (dense housing with difficult access). The project should not result in any changes in the area that would result in wildland fires. (1, 5, 7, 14)				
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
discharge requirements? Draft Waste Discharge Requirements which also serve as a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit will be considered for adoption for this project. The draft NPDES Permit will be considered for adoption at the August 8, 2006 Regional Water Board meeting. No violations of the water quality standards or the NPDES permit are anticipated to result from the project. (1, 5, 13)				
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? The project consists of pumping groundwater that surfaces at the bottom of the old burn dump. The groundwater is contaminated with hexavalent chromium. The project will not result in a net loss or lowering of the groundwater table that would affect existing wells, existing land uses, or planned uses. (1, 5)				X
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? The project will not disturb Darby Creek. The project is designed to extract contaminated groundwater emanating out of the hill and entering Darby Creek. (5, 7)				X
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? Refer to VIII.a), b), and c) above.				X
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? This item is for projects that pave huge areas creating more runoff that could overload existing culverts, etc. The project does not include any paving and will not change any of the existing drainage systems. Therefore, the project will not create or contribute any new stormwater runoff or provide additional sources of polluted runoff. (1, 5, 7)				X
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? The project is designed to improve water quality by preventing the discharge of contaminated groundwater to Darby Creek. (1, 5)				X
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? There is no housing planned as part of this project. The project is not located within a flood zone.(13)				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? The project area is not within a 100-year flood hazard area. (13)				X
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? This item is for projects that could .cause flooding or trigger failure of a dam. The project site will not expose people or structures as a result of flooding or the failure of a levee or dam. (1)				X
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? The project site is not subject to seiche or tsunami. (1)				X
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community? The project would not divide a community. (1)				X
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? The project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation. (1, 5)				X
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? There are no habitat conversation plans or natural community conservation plans which affect the project area (1, 5)				X
X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? <u>There are no mineral resources known to exist on the project site. (1, 5)</u>				X
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? Refer to X.a) above.				X
XI. NOISE B Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? The project will not result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards. The noise will be limited to construction activities. (1, 5)				
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? The project would not generate excessive groundborne vibration. No blasting or similar activity that could create vibration would occur during project construction. (1, 5, 7)				X
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? The project will increase the ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. However, the only recipients to the noise are local wildlife and cows. (1, 5, 7)				X
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? The construction activities will increase the noise level in the immediate area during the project. However, the construction activities will be temporary. (1, 5, 7)				
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? The project is not in the vicinity of a airport land use plan. (1, 10)				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. (1, 10)				X
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? The project will have no direct or indirect effect on population. (1, 5)				X
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? No housing will be displaced by the project (1, 5)				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? No people will be displaced by the project. (1, 5)				X

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

Fire protection?				X
Police protection?				X
Schools?				X
Parks?				X
Other public facilities?				X

The fire and police departments will continue to provide service to the area. The project will have no effect on population or housing, and therefore no effect on schools, parks or other facilities. (1, 6)

XIV. RECREATION --

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
--	--	--	--	---

The project will have no effect on population growth or the distribution of the population, and will have no effect on park use. (1, 5)

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? See Item 14(a) above.				X
--	--	--	--	---

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?				X
The project will not cause a substantial increase in traffic. A temporary increase in traffic will occur during project construction, in association with on-site workers and transport of equipment.				
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				X
See XV. a) above.				
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X
The project would not cause a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks. (1, 5)				
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
The project will not include hazardous design features or incompatible uses. (1, 5)				
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
The project will not result in inadequate emergency access. The local fire entity, the Little Lake Fire Department, will require high visible address posting of the project in order to respond to emergency calls. 1, 5, 14)				
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				X
The existing site has adequate parking to accommodate on-site workers and visitors to the site. (1, 5)				
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X
The project does not affect alternative modes of transportation. (1, 5)				
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS B				
Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
The site will be served by portable toilets during construction activities. (1, 5)				
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
cause significant environmental effects? The project would not require the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities. Water demand and wastewater generation would be minimal due to the type of project proposed. (1, 5)				
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? The project would not require the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities (1, 5)				X
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? Water service on the project site is not available. Water for construction activities will need to be brought in for dust suppression and any other construction needs.				X
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project=s projected demand in addition to the provider=s existing commitments? As discussed above, portable toilets will be brought to the site during construction activities. (1, 5)				X
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project ' s solid waste disposal needs? The project will not produce a significant amount of waste. (1, 5)				X
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE --

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? The project is designed to improve water quality in Darby Creek. Currently, groundwater contaminated with hexavalent chromium is discharging from the bottom of the former burn dump and discharging to Darby Creek. The extraction, treatment and discharge of highly treated groundwater to Darby Creek will improve the existing water quality.				X
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</p> <p>The project, when viewed along with the other site activities, generates no significant cumulative impacts.</p>				
<p>c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p> <p>There are no potential direct or indirect impacts on human beings identified in this Initial Study.</p>				X

List of References

1. Regional Water Board staff evaluation based on review of the project site and project description
2. Telephone Communication with Mendocino County Assessor's Office, May 17, 2006
3. Telephone Communication with Mendocino County Air Pollution Control District, May 17, 2006
4. Telephone Communication with Department of Fish and Game, May 10, 2006
5. Regional Water Board staff evaluation based on past experience
6. Telephone Communication with City of Willits, June 14, 2006
7. Report of Waste Discharge dated January 31, 2006, and Interim Remedial Action Work Plan dated January 27, 2006
8. California Environmental Quality Act, Cultural Resources Section 15064.5
9. Special Publication 42, Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act with Index to Earthquake Fault Zones Maps, Revised 1997
10. U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey, Willits Quadrangle, 7.5 Minute, 1991
11. California Government Code Section 65962.5
12. Department of Toxic Substances Control, Site Cleanup – Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program Database
13. FEMA Flood Insurance Map, Community Panel #060187-0001C
14. Telephone Communication with Little Lake Fire Department, June 14, 2006